

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 305

SP 038 708

AUTHOR Rafferty, Cathleen D.; Sperry, Linda L.; Huffman-Joley, Gail
TITLE Examining Scholarship. A Case Study in Redefining the Role
of the Professoriate.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education,
Washington, DC.
ISBN ISBN-0-89333-173-2
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM AACTE Publications, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 300,
Washington, DC 20005-4701; Tel: 202-293-2450; Fax:
202-457-8095; Web site: <http://www.aacte.org> (AACTE members
\$19.95, nonmembers \$23.95).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College Faculty; Educational Change;
Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher
Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Attitudes;
*Teacher Educators; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Indiana State University; Task Force Approach

ABSTRACT

This case study describes how the School of Education at Indiana State University launched an initiative to redefine the roles and responsibilities of its professoriate in 1995. Section 1, "Creating a Need for Change," discusses "External Pressures for Change in Colleges and Schools of Education," "Challenges for University-Wide Change," "Internal Pressures for Change," "Change in the School of Education," and "The Task Force of the Role of the Professoriate." Section 2, "Tackling the Process of Change," focuses on the "Role of the Professoriate Initiative--Getting Started"; "The Real Work Begins"; "A New Year, New Challenges, and New Insights"; "Life Beyond the Deadline"; and "Dissemination and Initial Reactions." Section 3, "Negotiating Issues and Nuances," discusses the document that was created, "The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education." This section focuses on the documents distinct elements and alterations. Section 4, "Assessing Faculty Perceptions," discusses the implementation of faculty and administrator interviews and interview results and implications. Section 5, "Implications and Future Directions," includes "Calling All Stakeholders," "Redefining Clarity of Vision," and "Keeping the Process Going." The four appendixes offer: the role of the professoriate in a contemporary school of education, the interview schedule, a list of task force members, and evaluation standards of scholarship. (Contains 30 references.) (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 433 305

EXAMINING SCHOLARSHIP

A Case Study in Redefining the Role of the Professoriate

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



Cathleen D. Rafferty
Linda L. Sperry
Gail Huffman-Joley

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

SP038708

EXAMINING SCHOLARSHIP

A Case Study in
Redefining the
Role of the
Professoriate



Cathleen D. Rafferty
Linda L. Sperry
Gail Huffman-Joley

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Examining Scholarship: A Case Study in Redefining the Role of the Professoriate may be ordered from:



AACTE Publications
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701
Tel: 202/293-2450
Fax: 202/457-8095
Web site: www.aacte.org

Single copy: \$23.95
\$19.95 AACTE members discounted price

Copyright © 1999 by American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN No: 0-89333-173-2

CONTENTS

Preface	5
1 Creating a Need for Change	9
2 Tackling the Process of Change	19
3 Negotiating Issues and Nuances	29
4 Assessing Faculty Perceptions	35
5 Implications and Future Directions	49
References	55
Appendices	59
About the Authors	77

PREFACE

In Fall 1995 when we began the work which culminated in this monograph, we had no intention of writing a case study. The dean who launched this Role of the Professoriate (ROP) initiative and the two faculty members who served as co-chairs focused primarily on the following charge:

1. Define, describe, and defend the role of the professoriate in the contemporary professional School of Education at Indiana State University. What does being a professional educator in the School of Education (SOE) mean? What should it mean?
2. Recommend a challenging and reasonable set of performance principles and guidelines for all SOE faculty which may be used for point of hire, promotion, tenure, performance-based salary, and on-going professional reviews. Include faculty rank as a component in these guidelines.
3. Recommend methods for improved peer-coaching and peer-review regarding quality teaching and advising, profession-based service, and scholarship, including creative and applied research as well as more traditional forms. (G. Huffman-Joley, memo, October 5, 1995)

The charge itself emerged from myriad external and internal pressures—many related to perceptions of the need for increased accountability for university faculty. Further, scholars such as John Goodlad and Ernest Boyer challenged universities to rethink both their missions and related faculty reward structures. A more detailed ratio-

nale which prompted formation of the ROP task force is contained in Chapter 1—Creating a Need for Change.

From its inception, the ROP initiative strove for democratic participation. Each of the six SOE departments had two representatives with the SOE Congress selecting three of the total number. The two co-chairs represented the two primary functions of the School—graduate education and undergraduate teacher preparation. Faculty representatives regularly updated their department colleagues; there were numerous open-forum meetings to discuss progress on the draft document; and drafts were distributed to all SOE faculty for feedback and suggestions. Further, once the final report was submitted to the Dean, it was subsequently revised by a SOE Congress committee prior to its endorsement of the principles and recommendations in the document titled *The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education*. Chapters 2 and 3—Tackling the Process of Change and Negotiating Issues and Nuances, respectively, address these items in full detail.

At this point we could have considered our work completed. However, during discussions and debriefings following the SOE Congress' endorsement, we began to speculate about the document's likely impact. Would it be filed and forgotten? Or, would it actually help departments and individual faculty to redefine their work?

Our discussions resulted in structured, systematic follow-up interviews with approximately one-fourth of the faculty and administrative staff. These data gave the school critical insights about both the ROP process and the ROP document that not only resulted in this monograph but also helped the process move forward. Chapter 4—Assessing Faculty Perceptions, and Chapter 5—Implications and Future Directions, explain procedures and results of data collection and analysis, and describe our reflections on what has been learned from this experience. Once data were collected and analyzed we began to realize that our work had moved from service to scholarship. As such, we hope that this work serves as an example for others seeking to redefine faculty roles, responsibilities, and rewards.

NOTE: As this monograph went to press in January 1999, the two faculty members who served as co-chairs for the ROP initiative were elected as their department representatives on a new SOE committee which will review and revise criteria, standards, and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure in the School of Education at Indiana State University. After this new committee convened, the same two people were elected to co-chair the committee.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to the faculty and administration of the School of Education for their participation in this school-wide initiative. In addition, we would like to acknowledge the support of the Indiana State University President and Provost for their careful reviews of early drafts of the ROP document. We would also like to thank the AACTE editors and the AACTE Committee on Publications and the *Journal of Teacher Education* members who provided us with invaluable insights and suggestions. Their nudging resulted in a case study monograph that we hope will assist others engaged in similar endeavors.

Correspondence concerning this report may be addressed to any of the authors in their respective departments at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN 47809.

Cathleen D. Rafferty
Linda L. Sperry
Gail Huffman-Joley

CHAPTER 1

CREATING A NEED FOR CHANGE

Toward the end of the decade of the 1980s, external and internal pressures were signaling that the role of the professoriate in the School of Education (SOE) at Indiana State University (ISU) needed to change. Reasons for this need for change came from many directions. Nationally, scholars who had documented the history and role of schools and colleges of education advocated the reform of teacher education. Furthermore, they urged the colleges to assume the role of true professional schools, by linking themselves to their primary constituents—educators in public schools. In addition, the mission of ISU, which evolved from a normal school for the preparation of teachers to a large multi-purpose university, significantly impacted roles and responsibilities of education professors.

External Pressures for Change in Colleges and Schools of Education

John Goodlad (1990), a primary external force for change in SOEs, described histories of SOEs in the United States that are comparable to ISU, as evolving from normal schools to universities. Through the evolution, schools of education had emulated the arts and sciences in university priorities for promotion and tenure which heavily emphasized experimental research and publications in scholarly journals. Among social scientists, the publications produced from experimental research, usually conducted in laboratory settings on campus, became the preferred standard for measuring and rewarding faculty productivity—tangible and quantifiable. Descriptive and correlational research studies, often necessary in the complex and dynamic settings of community schools, were viewed with suspicion and outright disdain in the academy for many years. In addition,

tion, faculty teaching and service, resistant to experimental manipulation, were regarded as difficult, if not impossible, to assess. Thus, experimental research acquired value as normal schools evolved into universities over the years. At the same time, thoughtful, effective teaching and professional community service, even though expected were diminished during these decades.

Goodlad (1990) argued that these university values did not encourage education faculty to work with colleagues in the public schools in serious ways to reform practice in the schools or to better prepare teachers—reform which the public increasingly advocated—as this sort of applied scholarship and profession-related service was given little recognition for promotion and tenure on campus. He stated, "Education had come of age within the norms of the arts and sciences departments, not the professional schools" (p. 78). Goodlad urged universities to redesign the university faculty reward structure so as to balance evenly teaching, scholarly activity, and participation in the renewal of schools.

Other external calls for change in how SOEs conducted business were influential during this time. Reformers such as Clifford and Guthrie (1988) advocated that education faculty should emulate other professional schools such as medicine, business, law, and engineering, which had remained closely linked to their practitioners. While major medical, business, law, and engineering schools all conducted research, their first objective remained preparing cadres of their respective professionals. Clifford and Guthrie (1988) said, "Imagine, if you can, a medical or law school that consciously eschewed preparing practitioners for their often mundane duties; that decided to alter its charter so as to de-emphasize its practical mission; or that deliberately sought to dampen or sever its ties with hospitals or the legal system" (p. 329). These authors argued that faculty in professional schools of education should reconnect much more closely with their natural constituents, colleagues in the public schools, to better support improvement in teaching and learning in both institutions.

External forces urging SOEs to change continued to increase. The Holmes Group (1990), a newly organized large consortium of SOEs in leading research institutions led by Judith Lanier, strongly urged formation of Professional Development School partnerships between member SOEs and local public schools. Along with Goodlad, the Holmes Group advocated the simultaneous renewal of both public schools and university schools of education, underscoring the increasing need for change in the role of the professor of education.

About this time, the Ford Foundation funded its "clinical schools" program which featured university-school partnerships, usually located in urban centers. Borrowing a theme from business and industrial leaders engaged in restructuring their organizations during this period, Phillip Schlechty (1990) called for significant change in the traditional roles, rules, and relationships of teachers, students, and administrators in the public schools. Reform and restructuring in higher education demanded similar change. Solo performing scholars were no longer cited as preferred role models. Rather, people were needed who could collaborate, work well with others, treat colleagues in public schools equitably, and understand the importance of the practical problems confronting school personnel. Critics increasingly warned that unless SOEs created and maintained serious partnership efforts to improve public education—where they were out in the community helping to solve real problems—the SOEs themselves were likely to become unnecessary and obsolete.

Challenges for University-Wide Change

In addition to these challenges to SOEs to change how they did their business, universities as a whole were challenged to change as well. Highly-respected educator, Ernest Boyer (1990), published the Carnegie report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. This report was built on work started by Eugene Rice, who had served as a scholar in residence at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer's report proposed broadening the notion of "scholarship" beyond its traditional focus on the creation of new knowledge through research. The report described scholarship as both effective teaching and the integration of knowledge which accomplished instructors implemented regularly to assist students in making important connections between and within ideas and disciplines. The report also suggested that "profession-related service" should be viewed as scholarship. The "application of knowledge" was seen as service in which scholarly efforts are focused on helping the local community, the state, or the nation with important issues of the day. The Carnegie report generated dialogue about the role of the professoriate and criteria for promotion and tenure on many campuses nationwide.

Public scrutiny and criticism of universities increased. Derek Bok, president emeritus of Harvard University, responded that universities were being criticized by the public, not so much because of increased tuition costs, but because universities were seen as unwilling

to work with the public to help solve problems that were important in the public's mind. "Today, universities need new ways to serve the public, and they do not have them," Bok (1992) said. "They do not embrace goals around which a new alliance can be forged. The result is a vacuum that attracts all manner of complaints and criticisms. If we would have it differently, we must associate ourselves prominently once again with efforts to solve problems that really concern the people of this country" (p. 18). Instead of seeming to be isolated and aloof from public concerns, Bok urged that universities reach out, form partnerships with communities for varied purposes, and through linking resources, help to address perplexing problems society was facing. For professional schools of education, and the university overall, he suggested that "one obvious possibility is the improvement of our public schools" (p. 18).

Internal Pressures for Change

During this time on the Indiana State University campus, internal indicators of a need for change were appearing as well. Many of the faculty took pride in the fact that the university's roots as a normal school dated from 1865. However, as the normal school had changed to become a comprehensive university, school of education faculty, like their counterparts in state universities across the country with similar histories, had lost sight of their primary role as a professional school of education and had, for the most part, grown far apart from their primary constituents—public school educators—during the intervening years (Huffman-Joley, 1998).

For many decades at ISU, the SOE faculty had a large laboratory school, which provided youngsters for preservice students to work with in field experiences and for faculty to study. With the exception of student teacher placements, nearly all of the early field experiences required in the undergraduate teacher preparation programs occurred in the lab school. Considerable graduate internship experiences and some research studies were conducted there as well. In addition, the SOE building itself featured a number of clinics where clients came for assessment and counseling. These included clinics for speech pathology, diagnosis of learning problems, and marriage and family therapy. Thus, most education faculty appeared to have little reason for sustained, significant linkages to public schools and community agencies because most of their needs for teaching and research seemed to be met on campus. This situation exemplified the contradiction which faculty faced: the pressure to conduct research

in controlled settings available on the campus in contrast with public pressures to be "in touch" with the *real* problems educators were facing in *real* schools and community agencies.

As a result, by the end of the 1980s, the SOE was seen by many public school personnel as "out of touch" with the realities of contemporary classrooms. Not unlike faculty in many colleges of education nationwide, the majority of faculty did not have regular contact or participation in the public schools.

The climate in the SOE began to show early indications of change in the late 1980s. Dean Stephen Hazlett launched a program in 1987 aimed at encouraging faculty to work with people in public schools on "school improvement projects." The focus on improvement of schools reflected reform efforts in the United States toward the end of the 1980s. As a beginning step in a gradual shift in the way faculty did their work, an interdisciplinary group of SOE faculty began to meet regularly to share the writings of educational reformers. Increasingly, they were persuaded that they, too, needed to connect in sustained ways with public school colleagues on meaningful school-based projects. The purposes of the school improvement program were to encourage more SOE faculty to engage in this kind of work, to provide institutional endorsement for the labor-intensive work involved in school-university partnering, to assist faculty in finding interested partners for their areas of expertise, to support them in seeking extramural funding, and, overall, to engage in sustained staff development of SOE faculty to advance these goals. Modest funds, provided by the ISU administration for the program, were made available to support the collaborative work. About 10 to 15 faculty-school projects were begun and several of the partnerships flourished, benefiting both the schools and the participating faculty members.

Multiple factors set the stage for even more dramatic change in how SOE faculty conducted business. These factors included the national climate for reform, the initial steps taken by the SOE, and the SOE's status as viewed by local public school constituents. Local circumstances changed dramatically which prompted immediate reaction. In 1991, the ISU Board of Trustees voted to close the laboratory school, effective the following year—the site where hundreds of early field experiences were readily provided each year would no longer be available. As a result, SOE faculty members would have to figure out new ways to do their work.

Change in the School of Education

The new dean, Gail Huffman-Joley, worked closely with the faculty and chairpersons to organize and lead a broad-based group called the Planning-for-a-Plan Committee. Based on the faculty's fledgling work with the school improvement projects and the national push for simultaneous reform through school-university partnering in the form of Professional Development Schools, the committee soon unanimously voted that the SOE should initiate discussion about forming a Professional Development School partnership with the local school district and other area districts. A definition for the PDSs was developed and with support from the vice president for academic affairs, the dean and members of the faculty approached local school district administrators. After gaining their support and the support of the teachers' union, SOE faculty teams made the case for becoming PDS partners at schools where they had been invited. It was not an easy sell given the public schools' perceptions of the SOE at the time, but by the spring of 1992, 10 schools in four area school districts had agreed to be PDS partners with the SOE. Several of these schools had been sites for the earlier school improvement projects, places where SOE and school faculty had established relationships and some trust had been developed.

The PDS partnership brought about significant change in SOE faculty roles. Because of the size and comprehensive nature of the partnership, preservice students were afforded multiple experiences in the diverse settings of the PDSs. Approximately half of the 78-member faculty was actively involved with the PDS sites. When faculty served on PDS school improvement teams, they met with school faculty at PDS sites to plan and implement field experiences for ISU preservice students, they served on the PDS steering committee to plan and oversee reform for schools and the university, and they taught course segments or complete courses at school sites. School-based collaborative inquiry projects, studies designed by school and university faculty, were an important aspect of the PDS partnership as well.

Another major influence which supported faculty development and change in faculty roles was the SOE's participation in the Urban Network for the Improvement of Teacher Education (UNITE) consortium. This consortium of nine universities, all engaged in serious reform efforts, provided funds for SOE faculty development designed around themes that included active learning, alternative assessment, clinical practice, collaborative inquiry, and teaching to diverse populations. In part due to the impetus which UNITE provided, the SOE

expanded its PDS partnership to include five PDS sites in inner-city Indianapolis, requiring even further change in faculty roles.

In addition, the Indiana Professional Standards Board adopted a system of performance-based standards and assessments for the preparation and on-going professional development of educators in the state. While building on the faculty development work which already had occurred in the ISU SOE, implementation of performance standards necessitated even further dramatic change in the role of the professoriate, with particular emphasis on teaching for understanding and demonstration of learning, as well as close collaboration with public schools.

During these years, a considerable number of faculty retired enabling the school to hire a cohort of new faculty. These new hires affected most departments and complemented the strengths of senior faculty. Many of the new faculty came with knowledge of and some experience with the reform practices the SOE had begun to implement. Some were anxious for the professors in the school to embrace even more change. Many sought to apply their knowledge with constituents in field-based settings. They supported increased self-evaluation and reflection for faculty through the development of portfolios designed to contain significant evidence to evaluate the quality of their work, mirroring those required for preservice and graduate teacher candidates.

Faculty concern regarding the time-intensive commitments of partnership work and the legitimacy of field-based action research in the larger university context soon emerged. Faculty worried that people on-campus, beyond the SOE, who were involved in making promotion and tenure decisions would not be knowledgeable about the changing roles and expectations for them as SOE faculty.

The university and the SOE's decision-making culture regarding tenure and promotion was similar to many other campuses, but also had unique features. The most unique aspect of the culture was that tenure and promotion decisions were almost completely separate from one another. Annually, all non-tenured, tenure-track faculty were reviewed by a departmental committee, the department chair, the dean, the provost, and the president. Tenure decisions followed the same course and included the Board of Trustees for final approval. There were no school-wide or university-wide committees involved in annual reviews or tenure decisions. In addition, there were no regular procedures for annual reviews of tenured faculty. Faculty promotion, however, required a review by the departmental committee, usually the same committee which conducted the annual reviews of non-

tenured, tenure-track faculty but at a different time of year, the department chair, a school-wide committee composed of representatives from each department, the dean, a university-wide committee with representatives from each of the schools and the college, the provost, and ultimately, the president and board of trustees. As a result, these processes tended to make the tenure decision a less public, less political, and less feared event than the promotion decision which involved two faculty committees evaluating across units.

The ISU Faculty Senate is the legislative authority of the university faculty. According to the *ISU University Handbook* (1991), the faculty senate has primary authority to formulate policy governing curriculum, facilitation of teaching and research, standards for admission and retention of students, faculty conduct, faculty appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, and other related issues. The senate also has advisory authority on matters of institutional policy regarding selection and removal of principal administrative officers having university-wide responsibilities, university budgets, faculty benefits, student conduct, and other matters.

The president and provost meet with the senate regularly and senate's recommendations regarding a wide range of issues are given careful consideration by the administration. In recent years, the senate has debated sharply the topic of "pay-for-performance" for faculty, including discussion of whether to adopt such a system and the process for determining salary recommendations. The SOE Congress, the faculty governance body of the school, had authority as detailed in its Constitution, to formulate policy, exercise review, and provide advice and consent on matters regarding curriculum, facilitation of teaching and research, admission and retention of students, and faculty appointments, retention, tenure, and promotion. The dean and associate dean regularly meet with the Congress and also consider their recommendations regarding curricular matters and many other issues within their purview. Thus, the complex decision-making culture at the university and the school had to be carefully considered throughout the Role of the Professoriate (ROP) process.

The Task Force of the Role of the Professoriate

Years before the ROP process actually began, during the university-wide strategic planning process in 1992-93, SOE faculty had identified as a school goal the clarification of new roles and expectations for the education professoriate in a contemporary school of education. This goal was underscored during development of the SOE strategic plan in 1994. Soon thereafter, the University moved toward a

pay-for-performance system, further necessitating clarification of roles, expectations, and criteria for evaluation of faculty performance.

As these forces for change converged, the need for improved clarification of faculty roles and expectations across the SOE became increasingly evident. SOE faculty sought ways to make their newly evolving and more responsive role legitimate for themselves and for others. They sought recognition and acceptance of a greater balance in expectations for faculty that included the scholarship of teaching; the scholarship of applied, profession-related service; and the scholarship of both traditional and applied research. Heretofore, with six departments and approximately 78 faculty, the SOE had never had a document which addressed roles and expectations for faculty across the school. The identification and charge to the SOE Task Force on the Role of the Professoriate triggered serious study and action on this important issue.

During the process, numerous points of conflict emerged because of the "high stakes" nature of the issues under consideration. Fundamentally, the role of the professoriate and its relationship to promotion, tenure, and pay-for-performance decisions directly influences each faculty member's quality of life. Interests, values, concerns, and fears are understandably heightened when a document is being designed to address the very nature of what it is each does as a professional. Given the nature of the issues being discussed, it was particularly important that the process be democratic and that all participants have voice and power in the development of and in decisions involving the document. To this end, the dean's leadership strategy emphasized inclusiveness, multiple opportunities for various forms of ownership, and positive intellectual and political support for the process. The key issues which were confronted as the process evolved and the strategies that were implemented to maximize participation will be discussed and analyzed in the order in which the resulting document, *The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education* (see Appendix A), was developed over time.

CHAPTER 2

TACKLING THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

As noted in the previous chapter, numerous factors interacted to precipitate impending changes in the roles and reward structures of colleges and universities. Ernest Boyer's 1990 report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, certainly encapsulated, crystallized, and in some respects, legitimized concerns previously held by some faculty and administrators in higher education. If the 60 Minutes documentary, "College Teaching—Get Real" (Hartman, 1995), is a valid barometer, the public is also well-apprised of these critical issues and expects change. Even a recent report by the Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum (1996) indicates that both higher education faculty and administrators acknowledge that teaching is, or should be, a critical factor in evaluating faculty performance.

A blessing and an irony resulting from the recent focus on faculty roles and responsibilities is the redefinition of scholarship that legitimizes teaching as an important enterprise. Of course, this emphasis on teaching is also consistent with The Holmes Group (1990) initiative advocating the simultaneous renewal of both schools and schools of education to improve teaching and learning in both arenas through collaboration in Professional Development Schools. Further, this increased emphasis on such site-based collaboration is a relatively new phenomenon that not only redefines faculty roles, but also may tend to exacerbate existing tensions between teacher preparation departments and those with a graduate clinical emphasis.

As Boyer and others have noted, however, an emphasis on teaching and site-based collaboration does not preclude a focus on faculty roles as scholars—it merely provides a space in which more faculty from various schools, colleges, and departments of education can be recognized for their unique and valuable contributions to students,

to departments, colleges and schools within their respective universities, to various professions and professional organizations, and to society as a whole. In sum, a system which can acknowledge and reward diverse contributions is better equipped to support faculty growth and development to better address the multifaceted challenges of today's society through the scholarship of application, discovery, integration, and teaching.

Role of the Professoriate Initiative—Getting Started

Such was the context in which the Role of the Professoriate initiative was launched during fall semester 1995. Commissioned by SOE Dean Gail Huffman-Joley in early October, the task force first met in mid-October to discuss the following charge:

1. Define, describe, and defend the role of the professoriate in the contemporary, professional School of Education at Indiana State University. What does "being" a professional educator in the School of Education at Indiana State University mean? What should it mean?
2. Recommend a challenging and reasonable set of performance principles and guidelines for all SOE faculty which may be used for point of hire, promotion, tenure, performance-based salary, and on-going professional reviews. Include faculty rank as a component in these guidelines.
3. Recommend methods for improved peer-coaching and peer-review regarding quality teaching and advising, profession-based service, and scholarship, including creative and applied research as well as more traditional forms. (G. Huffman-Joley, memo, October 5, 1995)

The 12-member task force was comprised of two representatives from each of the six SOE departments (see Appendix C); one member was a department chair and three were selected by the School of Education Congress from its membership. The dean intentionally chose this method of determining task force members and it represented a significant change in the type of leadership role played by the SOE Congress in the development of such a document. The task force members represented a diversity of gender, ethnicity, rank, and length of service at ISU. One co-chair represented a graduate clinical department while the other was drawn from a teacher education department. In other words, a deliberate attempt was made to include

a representative cross-section of SOE faculty members; however, while appointments were made to help ensure an array of perspectives and insights, the task force was primarily comprised of faculty who would support the premise of change. Many task force members were familiar with the recent work by Fullan (1993) on the change process, and a tacit understanding seemed to be that the task force would be testing many, if not all, of his "eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change" (pp. 21-41).

Task force members received copies of a number of readings which provided a common language and foundation for deliberations. These included *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990); AAHE's work regarding peer review of teaching in conjunction with Lee Shulman at Stanford University (Hutchings, 1994, 1995) and *The Teaching Portfolio* (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991); articles in *Change* magazine (Edgerton, 1993; Guskin, 1994); an ASHE/ERIC Report (Keig & Waggoner, 1994); various publications about Professional Development Schools; the School of Education Strategic Planning document (1994); and references to ISU Handbook (1991) sections related to tenure and promotion. *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997), a resource that could have further informed the work of participants in this change effort, was not published at the time the task force met in 1995 and 1996.

In addition to the three-part charge, the following assumptions were also clarified at the October 1995 meeting:

1. The document will be a draft document. The draft document will be circulated for discussion, response, and input from the faculty so that a refined iteration can then be developed by the Task Force. The revised document will be presented to the SOE Congress for approval.
2. Departments will need flexibility in applying and tailoring definitions, principles, and guidelines to faculty within specific programs.
3. Each department has two faculty members on the Task Force. Three faculty members also represent the SOE Congress. All Task Force members have a responsibility to report on the work of the Task Force regularly to their respective groups and to solicit input from the groups to bring to the Task Force, as needed.
4. The Task Force is requested to develop a draft document by March 1, 1996. During the period of time in

which the Schoolwide Task Force is deliberating, each department is being requested to review its document of criteria for promotion, tenure, and performance-based salary adjustments. This underscores the importance of communication with the Schoolwide Task Force. During March, the draft document will be available for departmental and Schoolwide discussion and response. While a fully revised document may not be ready this spring, the ongoing discussion and dialogue, as well as the draft document, will aid all of us in moving toward increased understanding of expectations for faculty, greater congruence in decisions about faculty performance within the School, and a rationale for our decisions for the campus so that others have greater understanding of our work. (G. Huffman-Joley, memo, October 5, 1995)

These assumptions echo many of the notions presented by Fullan (1993) regarding the complexity of change. For example, the emphasis on a draft and feedback cycle correlate with being unable to "mandate what matters" and that "every person is a change agent." Noting that departments need flexibility connects with "individualism and collectivism needing equal power" and that "neither centralization nor decentralization works." And, the notion that the discussions would be ongoing acknowledges that "change is a journey not a blueprint" (pp. 21-22). In retrospect, it might have been helpful to make explicit these correlations regarding the charge, the assumptions undergirding the task force's work, and the change process. On the other hand, it could be that such understanding of these parallels was possible only after the task force had completed its work.

The Real Work Begins

Subsequent to receiving clarification of the charge and assumptions, bi-weekly meetings for the remainder of fall semester 1995 were scheduled. Between late October and mid-December, the task force met four times and subcommittees met at least once before the December meeting to draft portions related to the first part of the charge, "defining, describing, and defending the role of the professoriate."

Prior to the first meeting, co-chairs sent an electronic communication to all task force members apprising them of the meeting schedule and requesting that they read materials distributed by the dean to identify ideas connected to various parts of the charge. It was nec-

essary to spend some time with introductions, but the majority of time was spent reacting to and discussing the charge, identifying connections between the charge and readings, and clarifying operating procedures. Ideas were captured on chart paper, subsequently typed, and disseminated electronically.

The focus of meeting two was Boyer's notion of scholarship, particularly as it related to examples that task force members could identify from their own work. Not surprisingly, through brainstorming it was quickly evident that members brought many different views and perspectives to this task. Although task force members were faculty within a school of education, they were also spokespersons from three departments with a distinct mission of teacher preparation and three departments with a graduate clinical focus. The difference in conceptions of scholarship across departments was confirmed through such examples as, "working with teachers in Professional Development Schools," "creating curriculum and instructional materials for use in P-12 classrooms," "writing grant proposals," and "publishing in peer-reviewed journals."

The task force, now more aware of individual and departmental distinctions as well as potential areas for intersection, began a more deliberate and specific focus on the first part of the charge. Because a number of task force members had also worked on the SOE Strategic Plan (1994) two years earlier, it made sense to use the "Mission and Goals" section of that document as a springboard to defining professional roles. At least four reasons were evident: there was familiarity with Strategic Plan ideas which might expedite the process; the strategic planning process had involved numerous SOE faculty and had been officially endorsed by SOE Congress; developing faculty roles to fulfill the school's previously identified mission and goals intuitively made sense; and use of previous documents underscored their importance and the significance of work completed by previous committees. The two co-chairs suggested that task force members subdivide to focus on a cluster of mission and goals items from the strategic plan. The suggestion was adopted, and the three subcommittees worked to draft ideas prior to the final meeting of fall 1995 in mid-December. Subcommittees addressed concerns related to "Professional Community/Shared Leadership," "Teaching and Learning," and "Research and Service."

All materials from the three subcommittees were submitted to the co-chairs prior to the meeting. This enabled one of the co-chairs to draft a four-page synthesis document which was distributed, debated, and amended at the December meeting. True to form, task

force members deliberated both syntax and semantics—"finalizing" three of seven items in Section I of *The Role of the Professoriate in a Professional School of Education*. Several days hence, one co-chair distributed the revised working draft, requesting that members shift attention to the remaining items when they reconvened in January, 1996.

A New Year, New Challenges, and New Insights

Based on the experience in fall 1995, the co-chairs knew that longer, more frequent meetings would be necessary. Beginning in mid-January 1996, the task force met weekly for one and one-half hours. Task force members were also reminded by the SOE dean that departments would soon be making pay-for-performance decisions and could benefit from a draft of their work. Whether by accident, design, or merely as a result of the complexity of this work, the task force managed to "finish" only the fourth item from the ROP list at the first meeting in mid-January. Despite any pressure that the co-chairs felt or tried to convey, the task force seemed unimpressed or perhaps unmotivated by deadlines or urgent requests for a draft.

Perhaps some of the pace could be attributed to a perceived lack of impact that committee recommendations and task force reports had in the past. Certainly, faculty at this and other institutions have had such experience, but the co-chairs had hoped that by working from existing documents some of this perception might be avoided. Whatever the reason, the task force seemed mired in semantics and nuances of the text while being pressured to produce. However, one more item in part 1 was revised at the next meeting. When a draft was forwarded to the dean, she noted that the task force might want to consider adding language that specifically identified the importance of advisement and recruitment of students. The task force complied, and a draft was made available to all SOE faculty on January 24, 1996. The cover letter identified all task force members, their department affiliation, and phone numbers. It was co-signed by the dean and both co-chairs, who emphasized its draft status, especially regarding items which had not yet been deliberated by the task force, and requested that faculty contact task force members to provide reactions and feedback. Later that month, at the dean's behest, a copy was also sent to the provost and president.

Now that a draft document had been circulated, task force members were prepared to respond to colleagues' reactions. Little feedback was received and the co-chairs requested that task force members solicit input from colleagues during department meetings. In Febru-

ary, 1996, two things happened. First, the provost distributed a lengthy memo regarding departmental preparations for faculty performance-based salary adjustments. The timing of the provost's memo, on the heels of recent dissemination of the ROP draft document, seemed to link the two documents—a situation that dogged the task force for months to come. Pay-for-performance and the ROP initiative were now seen by some SOE faculty as inexorably linked, if not synonymous administrative ventures, and therefore, to be viewed with suspicion and/or skepticism. In other words, some faculty wondered if the ROP might be part of an administrative agenda being forced on faculty.

Second, also in February, one of the SOE graduate clinical departments submitted a formal reaction and recommended changes to the ROP draft. The memo suggested that the section on professorial roles use language to include professionals being prepared in the SOE who were not directly involved in teacher education. Part of the rationale for this change also provided an example of the perceived division between teacher education and clinical and graduate departments conveyed in language such as "this [draft language] needlessly pits half of the SOE against the other half" and "has created many hard feelings on the part of professors on both sides of the issue" (ISU Department of Educational and School Psychology, memo, February 20, 1996).

Subsequently, the task force discussed this issue and noted the need to be mindful of use of inclusive language in future drafts. Initially, there had also been concern from graduate clinical department representatives that specifically mentioning PDSs made it a requirement for all. Some thought that it was too restrictive or overshadowed other relationships with schools not officially designated as PDS sites. After further deliberation and adding words such as "agencies" and "other schools," task force members were satisfied that the document represented the needs of all departments and their faculties.

Next task force members turned their attention to the remainder of part one and the initial work on part two of the charge dealing with establishing a "reasonable set of performance principles and guidelines which could be used for point of hire, promotion, tenure, performance-based salary, and on-going professional reviews." After considerable discussion, one task force member suggested using a grid listing these five categories along the vertical axis with three ranks (i.e., assistant, associate, full) on the horizontal axis.

During the next several meetings, other task force members experimented with various visual conceptualizations to push members'

thinking regarding expectations or criteria for performance guidelines. These discussions resulted in a draft list of eight general principles which was distributed to task force members via e-mail in preparation for the February 29, 1996 meeting. The principles were: specific criteria should be provided; the format for documentation should be explicit; evaluation methods should be described (e.g., ipsative, normative, criterion-referenced, etc.); reviews should be mandatory; professors should show balance across various dimensions over a specified period of time; such balance should be maintained and made explicit on a regular basis at departmental, school, and university levels; new faculty should be apprised of expectations; and a method for equitable distribution of responsibilities should be devised.

The nature of these recommended principles could be interpreted in various ways. Words such as "specific," "explicit," "described," and "mandatory," underscore what was seen as a lack of clarity regarding existing department and university performance guidelines. Also, inclusion of the items: "faculty being apprised of expectations" and "equitable distribution of responsibilities," suggests that roles and responsibilities were not perceived as clear or equitable. There was much discussion about current criteria or, the lack of criteria according to some faculty. The only existing document which addresses these issues, the *Indiana State University Handbook* (1991), contains several sections which speak to various retention, tenure, and promotion issues but provides definitive information only in regard to number of years in rank before being eligible for promotion or tenure and the procedures to be followed upon application for those decisions.

For example, the ISU Handbook (1991) section addressing teaching acknowledges that it is "difficult to evaluate" but that "when effectiveness of teaching is presented as the primary criterion to be considered for promotion the nomination form should be accompanied by evidence of superior teaching performance." The handbook also acknowledges that it is "difficult to establish criteria" to judge faculty effectiveness regarding service but "when such services are offered as criteria for promotion, they must be of demonstrated value to the university and/or other agencies for whom they are performed." Finally, the section addressing research is the briefest, noting that "in most fields, national recognition is to be considered the strongest criterion for evaluation of research and other creative activities" (p. 3-15). For a number of task force members, especially junior faculty or even experienced faculty with five or fewer years at

ISU, the development of more specific and explicit criteria was an important issue.

As indicated by the principles of "faculty being apprised of expectations" and "equitable distribution of responsibilities," there also seemed to be the perception, especially among junior faculty members, that, too often, junior faculty and newer faculty were shouldering disproportionate service loads. For example, they were elected to traditional faculty governance posts by department colleagues and they also were encouraged to participate in ad hoc interdisciplinary groups designed to promote teaching and research reform in the SOE. Often, because newer faculty were hired because they brought innovative ideas and experience, they assumed leadership roles in the ad hoc groups. These items signaled the need for a more equitable system of dissemination of service responsibilities.

Life Beyond the Deadline

In preparation for the March 21 meeting, the co-chairs met to draft a part of the remaining charge—"recommend methods for improved peer-coaching and peer-review regarding quality teaching and advising, profession-based service, and scholarship, including creative and applied research as well as more traditional forms"—and to prepare and distribute a draft document that compiled all work completed and/or drafted to date. Task force members were requested to make advance preparations for the meeting to expedite the process.

This approach was successful and resulted in fine-tuning of language in all three sections, but more work remained because many questions and issues surfaced regarding all aspects of peer review and mentoring. Questions such as: How would mentors be selected, trained, monitored, evaluated, and rewarded? Would a different kind of mentoring be necessary for experienced faculty new to ISU vs. faculty new to the academy? Would peers doing the review be from within the same department, the SOE, or from anywhere on campus? How can peer review be recognized as scholarship? Can peers provide feedback without also impacting performance pay or other types of monetary compensation decisions?

At a subsequent meeting these issues were further deliberated. Ultimately, it was determined that since the ROP document was intended to present recommended guidelines and procedures rather than to set policy, task force members were comfortable with including suggestions about definitions of and suggested procedures for mentoring, peer-review, and scholarship portfolios.

When the dean met with the task force in early April she expressed her pleasure with the task force's work in terms such as a "model for the campus," a "thorough treatment" of issues related to its charge, and which went "beyond initial expectations." But, additional questions remained: In what ways might faculty engagement with students be emphasized throughout the document? How do faculty members engage students? What are explicit and specific examples? How do we encourage faculty to critique their practice via videotaping, think aloud, and peer coaching? The dean also addressed task force members' questions regarding the next steps with the document upon completion of the final draft. The meeting resulted in additional revisions prior to the final task force meeting in which a discussion was planned regarding a recommended timetable for school-wide dissemination and follow-up. At the end-of-year faculty meeting the dean announced to faculty that the task force report was nearing completion and would be a focal point in fall 1996.

Dissemination and Initial Reactions

In late August 1996, the task force report was disseminated to all SOE faculty and sent to the SOE Congress for review and action. The cover memo to faculty announced that various task force members would present the document at an open meeting of the SOE Congress in early September. The memo also noted that the dean hoped that Congress would act on the report early in fall semester so that academic departments could begin to use the final version in deliberations regarding tenure, promotion, and performance-pay decisions and as a foundation to update current departmental guidelines.

The September 4, 1996, SOE Congress Open Meeting was well attended. The dean made introductory remarks followed by a panel presentation by the two co-chairs and two task force members who provided a rationale for change, overviewed the process used, and highlighted features from each of the three sections of the report. There was a question-and-answer time during which several faculty raised issues related to peer review and classroom visitations, equalizing of release time, making departmental guidelines more consistent across the SOE, scholarship portfolios, selection of faculty mentors, and professional development for post-tenure faculty. Given that the task force report broke much new ground, at least some task force members were surprised by how well the entire document was received, although there were some issues that obviously needed clarification. However, this may have been the calm before the storm.

CHAPTER 3

NEGOTIATING ISSUES AND NUANCES

Critical issues that arose once the SOE Congress and a revision team worked to produce the final document known as *The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education* which would later be endorsed by the SOE Congress will be addressed in this chapter. In addition, key elements and changes from the original report of the ROP task force to the final product will be analyzed.

Subsequent to the Open Forum that highlighted the ROP document, the report was presented to SOE Congress by the dean. A lengthy debate took place within the Congress, and the debate continued as representatives conducted discussion of the document in their respective departments and brought departmental responses back to the Congress.

Among the issues raised was one of "individualism versus collectivism." The issue of academic freedom and the role of the University Handbook became intertwined as well. Some faculty feared that the unmistakable shift toward increased collaboration between university colleagues and between university and site-based partners espoused in the document, would dictate that collaboration was the only acceptable method valued and that work done individually would no longer be considered valuable. For many, the content and methods of teaching on the university campus were individual prerogatives guaranteed under the principles of academic freedom as well as by the policies of the ISU Handbook. In this view, teaching is essentially a solitary endeavor, just as traditional teaching in public schools has been. Research has traditionally been conducted individually as well. Faculty response to the focus on collaboration included the following: "A broad conception of scholarship should in no way deprecate the time-honored scholarship of quantitative re-

search"; "the University Handbook specifically states that, "Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual instructor"; and "you have no right to tell me what to do in my classroom . . . it's academic freedom."

Several points of view were relevant in addressing this issue. New information signaled a change in traditional approaches to the role of education in the community. Studies of educational practice were indicating that collaboration and cooperative learning resulted in improved learning and the development of critical thinking. In addition, professional education faculty often have an obligation to prepare practitioners to meet mandated professional standards such as those developed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board. Thus, while still enjoying wide latitude with professional judgment regarding teaching, faculty in a professional school must also be responsible for developing educators using the best practices known. Finally, a demand by legislators and the public was made to address practical problems confronted by schools and agencies, and in doing so, to collaborate with site-based colleagues. Regardless, approval of collaborative scholarship efforts cannot mean that faculty working individually should no longer receive praise and recognition for their work. These concerns were addressed by adding language to better balance the dual values of "individualism and collectivism."

Another challenging issue emerged during the debate in the SOE Congress and within the departments: Was the ROP document a subtle attempt to develop criteria and mechanisms to later build cases for dismissal of unproductive tenured faculty? While this was not the intention of the ROP task force participants or the dean, the document did, in fact, call for annual reviews of all faculty, both non-tenured and tenured. While non-tenured faculty had traditionally been evaluated annually, the annual evaluation of tenured faculty was not a regular practice. One faculty member stated that, "Annual reviews are not necessary because tenure guarantees us a job. If this document mandates annual review it brings us another step closer to undermining tenure and is therefore unacceptable." Faculty who held this view argued strongly that it would be a mistake to endorse annual reviews of tenured faculty because tenure was viewed as a job guarantee. Furthermore, faculty who deliberated this point wanted assurances incorporated into the document that annual review materials, developed according to ROP guidelines, would not be used as part of a case for dismissal of tenured faculty. However, the Provost would not agree with that view, arguing that faculty portfolio evidence could conceivably be used in the unlikely event of dismissal

of tenured faculty. Again, a compromise was reached in the language of the document by including text stating that the intention of the ROP document was not to build a case for dismissal of tenured faculty.

After obtaining feedback from departments, the Congress appointed an editing team which consisted of one of the ROP task force co-chairs, the associate dean, two members of the Congress, and two additional faculty who had previously expressed strong concerns about the issues discussed above. Key participants in the ROP initiative believed that including faculty with different views from those espoused in the document would make it more likely that language in the revised document would be acceptable to the majority of the SOE Congress members and their constituents. This group met repeatedly to deliberate these and other issues as part of a revision process.

The process finally culminated in passage of the following motion on February 5, 1997:

The School of Education Congress endorses the principles and recommendations reflected in the document entitled *The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education* and strongly urges individual departments to incorporate these principles and recommendations into updated guidelines for hiring, performance review, tenure, and promotion. (W. Barratt, memo, February 6, 1997)

Approximately 15 months after the ROP task force was formed, a final document had been endorsed by the SOE Congress and distributed to all faculty. Although a number of issues were resolved through the revision process, the major issue regarding site-based collaboration between public school and university faculty in Professional Development Schools did not re-emerge. Apparently, faculty in teacher education departments had assumed new roles in these settings and enough time had elapsed that they felt comfortable and, in fact, were realizing the benefits of these new roles to students, to programs, to the schools, and to themselves. While it remains true that these new roles are different from more traditional roles of university faculty and that recognition for the scholarship involved in this type of teaching, service, and research is essential, the issue of whether or not to increase site-based work did not become a point of discussion among the teacher education faculty during the development of the final document.

Distinctive Elements and Alterations

A striking feature of the document is its comprehensive nature. It addresses all roles of the professoriate (teaching, research, and service) for all professors from initial hiring to annual evaluation of tenured faculty. It also represents a shift from an exclusive emphasis on basic research to a validation of other types of research including classroom inquiry as problem solving. In addition, there is a clear focus on the value of good teaching and endorsement of and suggestions for ways in which faculty can collaborate for enhanced productivity and collegiality. Finally, the document calls for creation of explicit evaluation criteria developed at the department level but grounded in concepts from the ROP document itself. The most significant changes between the original version and the one endorsed by the SOE Congress relate to performance guidelines.

The revised version of the ROP document (see Appendix A for the complete document) begins with a preamble which gives an overview of the charge, a brief description of each section, related purposes and assumptions underlying the section, and suggested uses. The preamble concludes with the notation that while the "document represents the best current thinking on faculty responsibilities and professional development in schools of education and that the principles and guidelines it contains deserve to be incorporated into the policies of the departments of the School of Education," it should "periodically be reviewed by a faculty group to make revisions as warranted by future research and current practice."

In this section, we provide a detailed examination of the revised document, endorsed by the SOE Congress, for distinctive features and major changes from the original task force report.

Section I—Definitions of the Role of the Professoriate reflects the fewest changes. Only one word (*agencies*) was added to item four which delineated a list of service sites within which university service seemed appropriate. Perhaps this section required little revision because faculty clearly understood their roles or perhaps it was attributable to the fact that this section was drafted from the SOE Strategic Plan (1994). This was also the section which was drafted first and distributed to all SOE faculty in January, 1996 and subsequently revised by the task force. Perhaps all are valid reasons it remained virtually intact.

As mentioned previously, *Section II—General Principles and Performance Guidelines*, is the section that received the most editing. Because this section addressed policies and procedures related to the evaluation of faculty performance, this is not surprising. Based on

issues raised at the Open Forum and during the SOE Congress revision process, language was added to indicate that performance appraisals should serve to promote professional growth and are not intended as punitive measures to dismiss tenured faculty.

Additional language also clarified that explicit, criterion-referenced performance guidelines would be developed at the department level and made available at the beginning of the evaluation period. However, rather than requiring documentation through a scholarship portfolio, portfolios were recommended as one of several options in the revised document. The notion of portfolios was new to many task force members, especially those from graduate clinical departments. After task force members had read and discussed information about teaching portfolios from AAHE, the concept of "scholarship portfolios" was expanded to encompass all aspects of one's work. The unfamiliarity for some of the SOE Congress members with portfolios could have been an issue. It is also possible that requiring additional work of faculty was perceived by some as too prescriptive and therefore a violation of the ISU Handbook (1991). At any rate, providing options rather than mandates also guided other changes.

The requirement of Professional Scholarship Plans (PSPs) for faculty was retained, but this notion was modified to ensure that individual plans were developed through collaboration and consensus at the department level. Also, rather than requiring that criteria identified for successful attainment of PSPs be considered for tenure, promotion, and salary adjustment decisions, it was optional in the revised document. In other words, faculty could set academic goals through a PSP but they would not necessarily be held to the attainment of these goals. Finally, rather than distinguishing between "post-tenure" or senior faculty status and "pre-tenure" or junior faculty status regarding PSPs, support for research, teaching, service, mentoring, and other professional development structures, language was changed to designate that all recommendations and support structures applied to "tenured" or "tenure-track" faculty. It was noted, however, that at point-of-hire, university service responsibilities for tenure-track faculty "should be kept to a minimum initially and should involve primarily activities directly related to the profession, teaching, or research." This compromise reduced tension that had developed between what some senior faculty may have perceived as "coddling" of junior faculty while still addressing a critical concern of junior faculty regarding their perception of heavy service responsibilities.

The final section, *Section III—Peer Collaboration, Induction/Mentoring, and Scholarship Portfolios*, was modified somewhat, primarily by shifting or merging components or ideas from one place to another. Two rather substantive changes are noteworthy. The original document used the language "Peer Review" because it was often present in the professional literature and it was the language used by the dean in the task force charge. In the final document this language was changed to "Peer Collaboration." The original document also contained an entire section entitled "Peer Review." Although much of the section's essence was merged with another section on Scholarship Portfolios, one part of the original rationale for dialogue about scholarship efforts through portfolio construction and peer review was deleted from the final document.

In summary, we can only speculate regarding the significance of changes wrought through the revision process, but much could be attributable to the nuances of language and the power of connotations. For example, the shift from "Peer Review" to "Peer Collaboration" could suggest discomfort with the notion of reviewing each others' professional practice or becoming directly involved in making performance pay recommendations. As noted by one senior faculty member, "I've never been evaluated in my classroom that I'm aware of but I have team-taught. In my view, though, that's collaboration, not evaluation. I'm fearful, even insecure, about peers evaluating peers' performance." In addition, it could be that, like portfolios, the concept of peer review/peer collaboration of teaching was new to many SOE Congress members. Not coincidentally, during the summer of 1997 at the national conference of the National Education Association the issue of peer review was hotly debated and a motion was passed that members could engage in the peer-review process (Bradley, 1997).

There is some evidence that faculty highly value individual autonomy because much that was "required" in the original document was rewritten as "optional." As such, the SOE Congress may have deemed it more prudent to soften expectations until there was evidence of the document's implementation and impact. Also, perhaps "wait and see" is the behavioral equivalent of a "status quo" attitude.

CHAPTER 4

ASSESSING FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

After the lengthy process of creating, disseminating, and advocating the Role of the Professoriate document, the SOE Congress vote in January, 1997, on the motion to endorse the document was not unanimous. In order to better understand the thinking of the SOE members, viewed as important in validating the initiative in terms of resources expended on it, the project steering committee (the dean and two co-chairs) decided to interview a random sample of the SOE faculty and administrators. The interview process provided rich insights into faculty perceptions of the ROP process and the revised ROP document.

Two important features of the initiative informed the steering committee's choice to use a standardized but open-ended interview instrument. First, considerable emotion had been evoked throughout the initiative concerning professional and disciplinary attachments (such as teacher education departments versus graduate clinical departments) as well as implications of performance pay and post-tenure reviews. Second, on the heels of the extended Project UNITE faculty development initiative, the ROP initiative had taken place over two successive academic years with changing roles for a wide variety of SOE members. People's memories have been shown to be affected by their emotions, the length of time between experiencing and recalling events, and their existing knowledge (e.g., Ashcraft, 1989). Therefore, the internal validity of the study was threatened by the lengthy time span of the initiative, the variable emotions across individuals and issues, and individual differences in existing knowledge of experiences of this sort and the general role of the professoriate. A standardized list of questions would allow every participant to be asked the same questions, thereby enhancing reliability. How-

ever, open-ended questions along with probes of any response that seem unclear or unfinished would enhance internal validity, which is the degree to which responses mirror the reality of participants' perceptions.

An interview, of course, is a sociolinguistic event in its own right, subject to social and linguistic constraints like any speech event (Briggs, 1986). For example, status differences between interviewer and interviewee can alter the participants' willingness to reveal information about themselves. Differences in the setting of the interview as well as structural variation in the questions can impact the referential content of responses. A variety of choices confronted the steering committee in terms of how to move forward with gathering data.

Implementation of the Interviews

Participants

Approximately one-fourth of the faculty and administrative staff in the SOE were asked to be interviewed. Of 22 persons initially asked, one person was unable to schedule an interview, which necessitated the substitution of one alternate. Participants' selection was based on role and rank. Specifically, administrators ($n=7$) included department chairs and the associate dean. In addition, 20 percent of the faculty were selected randomly at each rank (full, associate, and assistant). Seven faculty at full professor rank, four faculty at associate professor rank, and four faculty at assistant professor rank were selected. Although gender was not controlled during the selection process, 11 participants were female and 11 were male, which approximated the 45/55 percent split between female and male faculty in the school. Faculty who had been on sabbatical leave during one or two semesters of the two years in question were included. Persons who had been hired in the second year of the project (1996-97) were excluded on the grounds that they had not been present in the school from the beginning of the initiative in fall, 1995, and therefore could not reflect on attitudes prevalent throughout the initiative.

Procedures

Before any work was carried out, written procedures were established for contacting selected persons, obtaining informed consent, and conducting the interviews. The three members of the steering committee divided the workload evenly. As interviewers, they represented three different departments, and to prevent conflict of interest on behalf of both parties, interviewers were not assigned

interviewees from their own departments. Once interview assignments were made, interviewers initiated contact, sought informed consent, and carried out interviews with their assigned participants. Interviews occurred during April and May, 1997, near the end of the second year of the initiative.

Interviews were carried out in each participant's office. Informed consent was established at the beginning of each interview, which included permission for the interviewer to audiotape and take written notes during the interview. In the written notes, contextual circumstances throughout the interview were highlighted (for example, how nervous or open people appeared to be). In addition, a summary of the major points was noted. Interviews varied in duration but ranged between 20 and 90 minutes.

The Interview

The basic interview schedule was standardized and open-ended with the introduction of clinical interviewing techniques within specific questions to gain insight into the participant's line of reasoning. In other words, interview questions were asked in a particular order with a particular grammatical structure. Questions were designed grammatically to solicit open-ended responses with the understanding that additional questions within a question, as it were, could be pursued. No attempt was made to structure the impromptu questions. See the standardized interview schedule in Appendix B.

Analysis of Interview Responses

A deliberately inductive approach to the content analysis of interview responses was used in keeping with the ethnographic goal of understanding the initiative from the perspectives of the faculty and administration (Schieffelin & Cochran-Smith, 1984). Successive steps toward data reduction were taken. First, the audio transcripts were merged with the handwritten note record from the interview itself. Next, a second-order data reduction was undertaken to identify the substantive issues of each participant's response to each basic question. Then, substantive issues in each question were compared across respondents, and categories were created consisting of similar issues. Finally, frequency tallies were made of the number of respondents who mentioned particular issues in given questions. Faculty and administrators were subtotaled separately. Then, general issues across questions were abstracted and determinations of relative importance were reached on the basis of the frequency data.

Results of Interviews

Purpose of Initiative and Function of Document

Faculty responses to the first question about the purpose of the ROP initiative (see question one in Appendix B) are listed in Table 1 in rank order based on frequency of mention. Over half of the participants mentioned more than one purpose of the initiative. Two dominant perceptions prevailed: to "define teaching, service, and research" responsibilities and to "preserve fairness" through pay-for-performance guidelines. Another important perception was that the initiative was meant to "provide guidelines for accountability." Faculty who mentioned accountability exclusively emphasized internal accountability within the university while administrators exclusively emphasized external accountability at the levels of the community, region, and state. Finally, one-fourth of the group mentioned that one purpose of the initiative was to "outline needs assessment" for individual faculty goals.

In a more open-ended question about what the document should do for professors generally (see question seven in Appendix B), the most frequently mentioned function was to "provide benchmarks" for the evaluative process. The second and third most frequently mentioned functions were to "enable self reflection" and to "focus on teaching" while to "change faculty roles," and to "affirm what faculty already do" tied for fourth.

Table 1: Reflections on Purpose and Function

Purpose of Initiative		Function of Document	
Be fair in pay-for-performance	12	Establish benchmarks	11
Define teaching, service, and research	10	Reflect on self	7
Provide accountability	7	Focus on teaching	6
Enable needs assessment	6	Change faculty roles	5
Be Dean's legacy	2	Affirm what faculty do	5
		Create new possibilities	4
		Assess faculty work flexibly	3
		Push toward excellence	3
		Other	3

Note: The frequencies refer to the number of persons out of 22 who mentioned each theme.

The Process

Table 2 elaborates on the roles that participants reported having played as well as on perceptions of how the process was relevant (see questions two and four in Appendix B). Responses are listed in rank order based on frequency of mention. Results indicate that most persons perceived themselves as playing some role during the two-year-long process of the initiative. Some roles were appointed (creating the document as members of the task force), some were elected (debating and voting on the document as members of the SOE Congress), and some were voluntary (attending the Open Forum, reading the document drafts, and discussing the initiative within the department).

When questioned more specifically about how the process was relevant two dominant perceptions prevailed. First, 13 of the 22 participants discussed how the process was "democratic." For example, it was an open process, it was iterative, it occurred over time with multiple opportunities offered for participation, and it achieved balanced representation. Second, 12 participants referred to the orientation of the process as outcome-based; that is, the process had pay-for-performance, personal (self reflection), and teaching outcomes. Four faculty commented that the nature of this process—moving toward democracy and orienting toward outcomes—mimicked the shift in the orientation of universities generally.

Stated concerns about the process used during the initiative centered around the difficulties of sustaining forward momentum and achieving consensus. Two faculty referred to the dean's involvement (through constitution of the task force) as a factor that may have contraindicated the democratic aspects of the process.

Table 2: Roles and Aspects of the Process

Roles Played		Relevant Aspects of the Process	
Read document/attended forum	10	Democratic Process	13
Played a departmental role	8	Multiple opportunities	7
"I live this now" role	5	Openness	4
Served on Task Force	5	Occurred over time	3
Served on SOE Congress	4	Balanced representation	3
Worked on revision of document	4	Iterative	2
Served on role	4	Multiple formats	1
Served on Strategic Planning	1	Outcomes	12
		Pay for performance	8
		Personal	5
		Teaching	2
		Shift of universities	
		mimicked	4
		Organic/dynamic process	4
		Concerns	12
		Process may break down	6
		Consensus too difficult	5
		Cannot mandate change	2
		Dean's involvement	2

Note: The frequencies refer to the number of persons out of 22 who mentioned each theme.

Aspects of the Document

When participants were asked to list the most interesting aspects of the document (see question three in Appendix B), more positive aspects than concerns were reflected in the responses of participants, as shown in Table 3. Four aspects of the document received support from at least one-fourth of the participants. The fact that the document defined scholarship broadly, following Boyer, was the most frequently stated aspect. The mention of contractual possibilities, specifically the idea that tenured faculty might choose to focus on teaching scholarship to the exclusion of discovery scholarship, for example, occurred in more than one-third of participants' responses. Mentoring support of new faculty along with portfolio assessment,

to mirror what students and public school teachers are increasingly being asked to do, also occurred in the responses of approximately one-third of the faculty.

The differences between the current document from what has existed on this topic in the past history of the SOE was discussed in question eight (see Appendix B). Overwhelmingly, participants responded that this document is *more comprehensive*, both by being more specific and by emphasizing broader professional roles, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Reflections on the Document Now Compared to Then

Interesting Aspects Now		Now Compared to Then	
Broad definition of scholarship	13	More comprehensive	16
Contractual possibilities	8	More specific	13
Mentoring of new faculty	7	Broader emphasis	5
Portfolio assessment	7	Qualitative assessment	4
Peer review	3	Peer support	3
Change of institutional model	2	Focus on planning first	2
Too little focus on teaching	2	More dynamic assessment	1
Creation of tension	2	More feedback on	
Lack of emphasis on technology	1	evaluations	1
Inflexible structure	1	Focus on professional	
Incomplete modeling of process	1	research	1
		Guarantee of departmental	
		independence	1

Note: The frequencies refer to the number of persons out of 22 who mentioned each theme.

Effects of Initiative on Self and Department

Participants were asked to reflect on the effects of the initiative on self and on department in questions five and six (see Appendix B). The categories of response that emerged from the inductive analysis are listed in Table 4. In general, optimism waned during these responses. Approximately one-half of the participants conceded either that the initiative had no effect and was not being used or that it was seen as a threat and was bad for faculty. Two participants argued that there was no need for the initiative. Approximately one-half the

participants also said they were using the document, largely through debates about departmental guidelines, general discussion, or personal decision. Almost half the participants complained that this initiative was hard for faculty due to departmental divisiveness and motivational reasons.

Table 4: Is the Document Being Used and How?

Effects on Self-Department		How Has Document Been Used?	
Using Document	11	Used Document	18
Positive	10	Discussed/debated	15
Ambivalent	4	Guidelines in progress	9
Seen as Threat	2	Read	7
May Use Document	9	Currently doing it	4
Seen as Threat	5	Concerns	12
Positive	3	Hard for faculty	9
If mandated	2	Divisive for departments	4
No Effect	5	Bad for faculty	2
Not Needed	3	Not about teaching	1
		Fidelity of document at risk	1
		Not Used	6

Note: The frequencies refer to the number of persons out of 22 who mentioned each theme.

Down the Road for the Long View

The last two questions of the basic interview schedule asked participants to reflect on how the Role of the Professoriate initiative will influence faculty roles in five to 10 years and to make any final comments they desired (see questions nine and ten in Appendix B). As indicated in Table 5, a very broad range of responses occurred. Responses are listed in rank order based on frequency of mention.

The most frequent response to the influence question was that this initiative will serve as a model for the process of change. A broad range of specific expected improvements was elicited. Among the more frequently stated expectations for improvements were in the amount and quality of self reflection, teaching, and collaboration. Two major concerns were noted: all this work may go nowhere, and the

SOE may not be in line with the rest of campus. The only new theme to emerge during the final comments question was that more time will be needed to assess the impact of this initiative and that we may need to revisit the document again.

Table 5: The Future of the Role of the Professoriate

The ROP in 5 to 10 Years		Final Comments	
As model for change process	11	No comment	7
Specific Expected Improvements	17	Benefits	10
Self reflection	7	Changes definitions of	
Teaching	6	teaching, service, and	
Collaboration	6	research	4
Mentoring new faculty	4	Maintains our diversity	3
Research	4	Provides for follow-up after	
Overall improvement	3	evaluation	3
PDS cooperation	3	Provides common goals	1
Community responsiveness	2	Offers better process	1
University mission compliance	2	Concerns	7
School reform	1	More time is needed	3
Evaluation of teaching	1	Need to reduce evaluation	2
Portfolio assessment	1	New dean will arrive	2
Technology	1	Need to revisit document	1
Concerns	10	Keep it guidelines only	1
May go nowhere	7	Selection of personnel	
May be unacceptable		will be crucial	1
across campus	3	Need to "walk the talk"	1
May diminish our diversity	2		
May polarize faculty	2		
May result in too			
much evaluation	1		

Note: The frequencies refer to the number of persons out of 22 who mentioned each theme.

Implications of the Results

It is important to note that these interview results refer to the specific experiences of a group of individuals to a specific set of events that occurred within a specific historical time frame in a specific in-

stitution. However, within these constraints, the random sample of faculty yielded a wide range of perspectives on issues relevant to the ISU School of Education Role of the Professoriate Initiative. Such issues include the process of carrying out the initiative, features of the document produced through the auspices of the school-wide task force, and the impact of the initiative beyond the life of the task force.

The interview results suggest that the purposes of the initiative were perceived as fairly straightforward: definition of teaching, service, and research; fairness in evaluation; accountability; and faculty needs assessment. When asked to reconsider these purposes hypothetically (i.e., what *should* this initiative do for us?), a more specific concern with personal evaluation emerged as expressed in the duality between "affirm what we already do" and "change our roles." A second theme related to fostering good teaching emerged in the hypothetical.

The process of the initiative was perceived as outcome-oriented and democratic, both of which were assessed by participants as essentially positive characteristics. The fact that the process was widely held up as a model for future school-wide endeavors further confirms that the process used for the initiative was perceived favorably. One reason for this positive perception may have been that the initiative process over time involved almost everyone in the SOE in one way or another, partly because of a number of opportunities to participate in the initiative.

When asked about the most interesting aspects of the document, participants tended to focus on what was novel: Boyer's (1990) redefinition of scholarship; the idea of negotiating for an individual emphasis on teaching, service, or research; portfolio assessment; and peer review. Some concerns emerged but they focused on what was absent rather than criticism of what was included in the document, e.g., too little focus on teaching and technology. Almost without exception, the document was seen as a more specific and comprehensive step than anything previously used in the school.

This novelty, while attractive, at the same time was somewhat threatening, especially when considered in light of the persistent *status quo* mentality that was perceived as needing to be penetrated in order to initiate changes of this sort. Faculty as well as administrators despaired about the likelihood of organizing change of this perceived magnitude. The status quo mentality was demonstrated by a secure minority of faculty, who tended to be long-time tenured faculty, who reported either that the initiative had had no effect or that it should not be expected to have one. Additional evidence of the

status quo mentality seeped through the comments of self-identified innovators, who often referred to their difficulty in convincing other faculty to take seriously this change effort. Finally, there was a significant cadre of persons who diminished any perception of threat by suggesting that the essence of the initiative was already in place and working, either because they themselves personally decided to instantiate the processes referred to in the guidelines or because their departments were in the middle of instituting these changes in the course of normal departmental activity.

On the whole, participants seemed to be quite ambivalent with regard to the issue of instituting real change. A broad range of hopes and possibilities was envisioned in the wake of this initiative, including comments such as "this document will help me look at myself," "we need a scaffold for faculty to improve practice and scholarship," "this document will help bridge the gap between tradition and practice", and "this helps us establish benchmarks for self evaluation and peer review."

At the same time, there was a strong tendency to hold back, to wait and see. One administrator referred to the difficulty of moving forward because of the natural homeostasis of institutions. Indeed, comments were made about the paradox of trying to move forward through administrative mandates in an environment where "democratic process" is highly valued. Faculty were generally cynical about the SOE's ability to embrace change: one person referred to the "avoidance behavior" of some faculty because of their value on having the faculty "move in lock step;" in a slightly different vein, another faculty blamed the "competitiveness of the university environment." Some argued that the greater specificity of this document might threaten the "necessary diversity of academia—we must avoid becoming clones of one another."

In sum, a contradictory ambivalence permeated responses to several interview questions. Hall and Hord (1987) have referred to such ambivalence as characteristic of the pre-institutionalization phase of change. One stumbling block mentioned by many in the SOE included the imminent arrival of a new dean. Although this may have signaled pragmatism on the part of faculty, it may also have signaled a lack of ownership of this initiative. Other "comfortable" stumbling blocks included complaints about how hard change is—the difficulty of consensus, premonitions of divisiveness, problems with maintaining momentum and motivation for reform—as well as comments about all that had not yet been addressed, such as improving teaching, technology, diversity, or curriculum. Indicators which might be

considered to be even more ominous for the ultimate success of the reform effort were: the almost complete lack of reference to how the ROP guidelines should be turned into policy, and the persistent minority of faculty who would not acknowledge that any change was needed. Reform is easily co-opted by declarations of how the desired changes have already occurred.

On one hand, a review of the complexity of the change process, as described by Fullan (1993), and earlier by Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1987), suggests that several of the precursors of change were met by this initiative. First, every person is a change agent. Nearly everyone in the random sample felt that they had participated in the initiative in one way or another. Second, neither centralization nor decentralization by itself works. The creation of and charge to the task force was a move by the dean's office, but most of the input to the document came from the bottom-up experiences and reactions of the faculty working in departments. The decision to take the document through the faculty governance structure of the SOE Congress was made from the dean's office, but the genuine concerns about a perceived threat to tenure and the move toward portfolio assessment that emerged both during the Open Forum and later in the Congress revision process, were no doubt crucial to its overall endorsement. Third, individualism and collectivism must have equal power. This tension was referred to explicitly in the relation between faculty and department, and again between departments and the overall school and university. For example, the issue about collectivism versus individualism prompted substantive revisions of the early language of the document, and, at the same time, highlighted the truism of Fullan's fourth dictum that problems are beneficial. The multiple airings of the document, starting with initial and final task force drafts and ending with a final revision from the SOE Congress, provided important opportunities for debate, reflection, and revision. The interviews and the report of the interview results then allowed for another round of debate and reflection on specific problems, such as the perceived threat to tenure and implications for performance-based pay. Implementation vis-a-vis departmental performance-based-pay policies will generate another relatively high-stakes round of debate and revision.

On the other hand, Rallis and Zajano (1997) recommend that a collective agreement be reached regarding how to construe assessment efforts such as those undertaken here: various document revisions, the ethnographic analysis of faculty perceptions presented in this chapter, and policy implementations. They recommend distin-

guishing intermediate-level benchmarks from long-term outcomes. Tangible consequences, such as performance-pay decisions or policy decisions that remain in effect, may be labeled as long-term outcomes. Less tangible consequences, such as a characterization of the ROP initiative as democratic, are more difficult to categorize. At the time, these less tangible consequences would seem to be intermediate-level benchmarks, but it is likely that over time, with either formal or informal agreement, such characterizations will no doubt coalesce as an ideology that could be considered to be a long-term outcome. Change is a long-term process and one that requires vigilance on the part of leaders who understand the importance of ownership and involvement.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

"The demise of a reform initiative is often not due to its ineffectiveness, but rather to its inability to deliver immediate results, however inappropriate or impossible that expectation might be"
(Rallis & Zajano, 1997, p. 707).

Those directly involved in the ROP initiative have learned many valuable lessons to this point, but none seems more important than the realization that the process must continue. Several years into the initiative, this SOE and its faculty members seem to be in the "fire" stage of "ready, fire, aim" (Fullan, 1993) and much work remains before the reconceptualized roles, responsibilities, and suggested procedures outlined in the document become institutionalized.

As noted in this chapter's opening quote, reform efforts often languish because institutions are unable to see tangible, observable results in a "timely" fashion. Perhaps too often it is assumed that institutions have "fired" and missed, rather than realizing that they can learn from repeated "firings" and subsequently adjust their "aim." Alternatively, the original perceived need to change may no longer be present. Perhaps the initial urgency to change is fulfilled by any flurry of activity, which may create the perception that the desired change has occurred. As a result, assessment of progress toward the original goal is critical. Rallis and Zajano (1997) emphasize that the establishment and public announcement of benchmarks are both critical to the maintenance of any long-term initiative. Such deliberate communication about benchmarks may make participants more comfortable with the nature of institutional change. Given these consid-

erations, what additional approaches might enable institutions and their faculty members to "keep the faith until outcomes are obvious" and thereby increase the accuracy of their aim?

Calling All Stakeholders

Data presented in chapter 4 indicated that faculty appreciated the democratic nature of the ROP initiative. This included everything from the balanced representation of the task force itself, to the multiple opportunities to participate, to the openness of the process. If these elements were viewed favorably previously, then it follows that future involvement opportunities would help all constituents to continue to build a common vision of their expectations. In many respects the appointment of a task force and its work represented Fullan's "ready" stage (1993). The "fire" stage involved the forwarding of the task force report to the SOE Congress for review, revision, circulation, and endorsement. First attempts at "aiming" included the follow-up interviews reported here along with fall 1997 departmental efforts to write their own guidelines.

Democratic processes characterized activity in each of the stages. During the "ready" stage, drafts were circulated and task force members were encouraged to get feedback from their own department colleagues. The broader forum of the SOE Congress during the "fire" stage included multiple presentation and discussion opportunities for dissenters to voice their opinions, which in turn led to productive modifications of the original document. Finally, given the long tradition of democratic faculty governance at ISU, it is likely that departments will continue to utilize democratic processes in their "aim" stage of creating new departmental guidelines. For example, one SOE department drafted guidelines grounded in the ROP document and its departmental mission statement which had been written by a committee-of-the-whole. More specifically, this department required that each faculty member compile a portfolio and develop a Professional Scholarship Plan (PSP) as outlined in Section II—General Principles and Performance Guidelines of the document (see Appendix A). In addition, each faculty member expected to meet with the department chair during the subsequent academic year to discuss goals and progress toward their completion.

The establishment of departmental guidelines in fall, 1997 regarding pay-for-performance, promotion, and tenure evaluations—is a critical step in the overall reform effort. The new dean requested that departmental plans for annual reviews include reference to the ROP guidelines. Once departments implement their revised guidelines,

then faculty leaders and administrators can assess the impact and perhaps improve the "aim" for next time. However, it may be beneficial for several rounds of school-wide implementation, revision, and policy development to occur before further decisions are made regarding the viability of the document. One particular concern at this SOE is the rapid turnover of personnel before the year 2000 due to scheduled retirements. In addition, there is reason for caution in that programs are distinctive and may require different policies (Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum, 1996). In other words, a one-size-fits-all set of criteria may be neither viable nor desirable.

Refining Clarity of Vision

Scholars such as Boyer, Edgerton, Guskin, Hutchings, Keig, Waggoner, and Shulman significantly impacted the task force's work. Readings and discussions held by task force members helped to shape their perceptions of new descriptions of professorial roles, in particular Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990) influenced task force members' thinking. The insights derived from common study, however, are focused on descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of faculty. More clarity is still needed in understanding how to assess the quality of scholarship and how specific criteria can be brought to bear. Fortunately, resources are available to facilitate this work, too.

Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate (1997), the sequel to Boyer's seminal work on the professoriate, reflects on the results of the Carnegie Foundation's National Survey on the Re-examination of Faculty Roles and Rewards. In this monograph, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) also provide assessment standards for how scholarly work should be evaluated including suggestions for its documentation. For example, Glassick, et al. (1997) contend that the summary of standards contained in Appendix D applies equally well to the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

This description of standards of scholarly work provides a cogent example of flexible assessment standards which could allow for appropriate diversification of faculty roles under the scholarship umbrella. The authors also describe ways in which faculty can document performance in any of the four areas of scholarship and they provide suggestions regarding essential components for a "professional profile" which would be the essence of the review process. In other words, the profile (maybe similar to a portfolio) would contain a statement of professional responsibilities, a biographical sketch, and

selected samples of the scholar's best work accompanied by a reflective essay (Glassick, et al., 1997, pp. 43-49).

Scholars such as Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlin (1991) provide rich descriptions and examples of the teaching portfolio, and AAHE's work with Lee Shulman (1993) at Stanford University is a comprehensive resource for the peer review of teaching (Hutchings, 1994, 1995). This emphasis on peer review of teaching may lead to legitimization of the scholarship of teaching through critical discourse among a community of scholars. An additional resource would be a videotape from a national teleconference which featured Charles Glassick and others discussing issues and challenges faced at several universities involved in redefining faculty roles and rewards (Kent, 1998).

As important as it is to continue to clarify the vision with stakeholders most closely impacted by new roles, responsibilities, and assessment standards, the vision must be shared in common by all who may be called upon to assess their scholarly pursuits. "Although officials at many institutions agree on the importance of enlarging the definition of scholarship, they do not as readily find consensus on matters regarding the reward structure" (Glassick, et al., 1997, p. 16). This finding is also consistent with the follow-up interview data presented in Chapter 4 of this monograph. Many SOE faculty supported the process used to create the document and felt that new guidelines were appropriate and helpful, but many also adopted a "wait and see" attitude when asked if it would ultimately make a difference. Several also specifically voiced a concern that it might be unacceptable across campus. Refining clarity of vision and providing direction for such complex change processes require leadership at both faculty and administrative levels—leaders who share the vision, jointly share responsibility to direct such initiatives, and strategize ways to overcome inevitable challenges (Howey & Zimpher, 1994; Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum, 1996). The vision and leadership style of critical players are important considerations, especially in hiring decisions regarding new faculty and administrators.

Keeping the Process Going

One litmus test at the SOE was performance-pay decisions made in each department during spring 1998. Although these particular decisions are made within individual SOE departments, they entailed use of departmental criteria generated in the context of the SOE Congress-endorsed ROP document. Although a policy for performance-based pay has been adopted by the university, it is not yet fully

supported by faculty. As a result, the process for these decisions was contentious and will require on-going discussion and refinement. At a future date, it would seem important to survey faculty again and invite input regarding broader use of departmental criteria for high-stakes decisions such as promotion, tenure, and performance pay. It may even be prudent to consider developing school-wide criteria, but in that case, an open discussion would need to occur regarding the benefits and costs of either having multiple sets of criteria or moving toward consensus on a common set of criteria for the school.

In late September, 1997, the provost and vice president for academic affairs at ISU launched a university-wide initiative and a task force to review and recommend appropriate changes to existing promotion and tenure policies, procedures, and practices. One of the documents provided to members of the university-wide Promotion and Tenure task force was the ROP document endorsed by the SOE Congress. As such, the provost's recent initiative has the potential to address SOE faculty concerns that the ROP document "may go nowhere" or "be unacceptable across campus" (see Chapter 4, Table 5). It can also serve to inform colleagues in other departments and schools regarding similarities and differences in our various professional roles and responsibilities. It is also interesting to note that, like the ROP task force, this university-wide counterpart exceeded its initial deadline but did submit a report to the provost after the end of the spring 1998 semester.

The SOE at ISU, like other institutions wrestling with complex issues surrounding the redefinition of faculty roles and concomitant reward structures, has made progress toward a reconceptualization of institutionally-approved scholarship. However, the initiative to redefine the roles and responsibilities of faculty and to develop parallel reward structures is ongoing. Rather than continue to follow models developed by colleges or schools of arts and sciences, this professional SOE has provided leadership on its own campus, and hopefully for others who benefit from reading this case account.

As the SOE moves forward with this initiative, it is useful to build on its strengths. In this specific case, the experience the school has had with democratic processes as well as the essential diversity of the university community are two notable strengths. The approbation of the interviewed faculty and administrators for the democratic processes of the initiative reflects the goodwill and consensus that emerged from enabling diverse voices to speak and influence the original task. Ownership in this kind of endeavor necessarily results from multiple opportunities to participate in the process.

Changing faculty roles, including the re-evaluation of time spent in particular roles, was and will continue to be made more fruitful by acknowledging and capitalizing on the inherent diversity in the school. Edgerton (1993) acknowledges the difficult path of allowing individual departments to examine the issues of faculty roles and rewards from their unique perspectives of disciplinary and professional insights. An obvious benefit of encouraging reform from the departmental level up is the possible establishment of feedback loops between disciplinary and professional education perspectives that may actually enhance creativity and the pursuit of scholarship. A related benefit of such reform is the possible establishment of creative dialogue among faculty both within and across department lines that may energize the intrinsic commonality that university professors share in connecting with their students and each other through learning and teaching. The expanded definition of scholarship, reconceptualized to include teaching (Boyer, 1990; Shulman, 1993, 1997), legitimizes anew the role of professors as scholars who serve as bulwarks of education in universities now and for the future.

REFERENCES

- Ashcraft, M. H. (1989). *Human memory and cognition*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bok, D. (1992). Reclaiming the public trust. *Change*, July/August, 12-19.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bradley, A. (1997). Fate of peer review rests with NEA locals. *Education Week*, August, 6.
- Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language: Vol. 1. Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school—A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edgerton, R. (1993). The re-examination of faculty priorities. *Change*, July/August, 10-25. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. L. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guskin, A. (1994). Restructuring the role of faculty. *Change*, September/October, 16-28. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Hartman, R. (1995, August 25). College teaching—get real. *60 Minutes*. New York: Columbia Broadcasting System.
- The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L. & Hall, G. E. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Howey, K. R. & Zimpher, N. L. (Eds.) (1994). *Informing faculty development for teacher educators*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Huffman-Joley, G. M. (1998). Reconstructing the community of the school of education: Influencing habits of mind, discourse, work, and results. In K. R. Howey & D. Theissen (Eds.) *Agents, provocateurs: Reform-minded leaders for schools of education* (pp. 97-126). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Hutchings, P. (Ed). (1995). *From idea to prototype: The peer review of teaching. A project workbook*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Hutchings, P. (1994). Peer review of teaching: From idea to prototype. *AAHE Bulletin*, 47 (3), 3-7.
- Indiana State University. (1991). *Indiana State University Handbook*. Terre Haute, IN: Author.
- Indiana State University. (1994, April). *Strategic Planning Report of the School of Education*. Terre Haute, IN: Author.
- Keig, L. & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). *Collaborative peer review: The role of faculty in improving college teaching*. Washington, DC: George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Kent, R.E. (Producer/Director). (1998). *A conversation on . . . New approaches to faculty roles and rewards*. [Video]. Oshkosh, WI: Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.
- Rallis, S. F. & Zajano, N. C. (1997). Keeping the faith until the outcomes are obvious. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (9), 706-709.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Cochrane-Smith, M. (1984). Learning to read culturally. In H. Goelman, A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy* (pp. 3-23). Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Schlechty, P. C. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Shulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property. *Change*, November/December, 6-7.
- Shulman, L. S. (1997, September). The scholarship of teaching. Presentation at the biannual meetings of the National Academy of Education, NAE/Spencer Fellows Postdoctoral Professional Development Retreat, Boulder, CO.
- Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum. (1996). *Restructuring the university reward system*. Fort Worth, TX: Author.

APPENDIX A

THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSORiate IN A CONTEMPORARY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

*Based on the August 1996 Report of the Task Force
on the Role of the Professoriate
January 1997
School of Education
Indiana State University*

Preamble

The original version of the document which follows, "The Role of the Professoriate in a Contemporary School of Education," was prepared by the 11-member faculty Task Force on the Role of the Professoriate in the fall of 1995 and the spring of 1996 (see Appendix C). The document is intended (1) to define, describe, and defend the role of the professoriate in a contemporary school of education, (2) to recommend a set of performance principles and guidelines which can be utilized by Indiana State University's School of Education and its departments in support of professional development and in decisions related to hiring, promotion, awarding of tenure, and salary adjustments, and (3) to recommend methods for peer collaboration as one means to continue promoting quality teaching and advising, profession-based service, and scholarship.

The first section of the document, which defines the expanding role of the education professoriate, is included to help ensure that new and veteran faculty members and administrators in the School of Education and faculty and administrative colleagues across campus are aware of the full breadth of professional activities which the School's faculty considers legitimate and important focuses of faculty time, energy, and intellect in a contemporary school of education. This section is intended to provide a collectively constructed

definition of the professoriate to guide School of Education faculty members as they allocate their efforts. It is assumed that the departments of the School of Education will incorporate elements of this definition into their policies in order to give faculty members some assurance regarding the appropriateness of their efforts as teachers, service participants, and scholars.

The second section of the document, which provides guidelines for procedures by which School of Education faculty members can present evidence of the nature, quantity, and quality of their professional endeavors, is designed to present a coherent, integrated approach for documenting faculty performance. A uniform approach developed by faculty members at the School level and adopted at the department level will help ensure that faculty members and administrators will have available the kinds of information useful in supporting collaboration in professional development and helpful in reaching consensus on recommendations and decisions regarding promotion, awarding of tenure, and salary adjustments.

The third section of the document, which outlines processes by which faculty members can provide one another support in professional development, is intended to introduce procedures with which some faculty members in the School of Education may not be familiar but which have proved strongly supportive of professional development in other university settings. The assumption is that, if procedures such as these are adopted by the departments or at least become common practice in the School, the existing requirements for faculty review can move beyond purely evaluative mandates to ones which promote professional development in all areas of teaching, service, and scholarship.

The belief of the Task Force is that this document represents the best current thinking on faculty responsibilities and professional development in schools of education and that the principles and guidelines it contains deserve to be incorporated into the policies of the departments of the School of Education. Nevertheless, the Task Force and the School of Education Congress recognize that new and sometimes better ideas will emerge regarding the role of the education professoriate and regarding support for development of the professoriate. The School of Education Congress, therefore, recommends that a faculty group periodically review this document and make revisions to better reflect the best current thinking in these areas and that the departments, in turn, revise their policies with that thinking in mind.

Section I—Definitions of the Role of the Professoriate

1. The defining role of the professoriate is to engage in scholarship. Given that the School of Education is a learning community, the professoriate bears responsibility to promote through engagement the values of knowledge acquisition, inquiry, and lifelong learning among students, colleagues, the community, and the profession.

Scholarship is broadly conceived, reflecting respect for the wisdom of practice as well as insight derived from scientific study and philosophical inquiry. Such scholarship serves the interdependent functions of discovery, integration, application, and teaching (Boyer, 1990). Traditionally, research both acknowledged and valued in academia has been what Boyer terms the scholarship of discovery, that is, knowledge created in a disciplined way for its own sake. Scholarship can also entail other functions such as 1) *integration*, which involves the synthesis of one's own investigation or that of others into larger intellectual patterns; 2) *application*, which implies that a problem with extrinsic, designated value motivates what then becomes a dynamic interaction between theory and practice; and 3) *teaching*, which sustains the continuity of knowledge and involves all activity which builds bridges between the student's learning and the teacher's understanding. In other words, the scholarship of teaching is activity which becomes consequential as it is understood by others.

Each of these functions of scholarship entails the responsibility of ongoing assessment to establish baselines for the improvement of the work of our students, ourselves, and our programs.

2. School of Education professors have what is both a unique opportunity and responsibility to impact students by:

- a. creating supportive relationships with students,
- b. understanding the individuality of each student and providing opportunities for students to make choices,
- c. promoting successful yet challenging experiences for students,
- d. motivating students to become excited about the learning process as well as the content.

3. Teaching and advising are activities central to any professor's program of scholarship. Through our example, we expect to show our students:

- a. that research and theory are linked to decision making;
- b. that professional development is practiced continually through reflection on practice as well as through traditional professional development activities (e.g., course work, workshops, action research, work in professional development schools and clinics);
- c. that choice of teaching strategies (e.g., lecture, discussion, cooperative learning, experiential learning, peer teaching, role playing) must be related to teaching for understanding;
- d. that data-driven decisions should be used to inform and improve our teaching and practice. Such decisions might be based on traditional as well as alternative data-collection practices and assessment devices (e.g., portfolios, video-analysis, learning logs, concept mapping);
- e. that the relationship between advisee and mentor or teacher and student is pre-eminent.

4. The application function of scholarship, in particular, includes what has been traditionally termed "service"—service to schools, the community, the University, and the profession. Given the School of Education's affiliation with professional development schools, other schools, clinics, agencies, and other service sites within the University and community, it is expected that faculty are actively involved in analyzing challenges and helping to create solutions. In addition, SOE faculty participate in the University through service at the department, School and/or University levels and in the profession through service at the local, regional, national, and/or international levels.

5. Scholarship of any kind may be collaborative or individual. If collaborative, it may occur with participants in a variety of settings such as universities, schools, and direct service providers. Scholarship also entails documentation of its process and dissemination of its product in a variety of formats, e.g., publications that are peer-reviewed, invited, edited, or other; professional or academic presentations; professional reports. Finally, scholarship may be conducted within a variety of paradigms using a variety of techniques, including experimental, quasi-experimental, and case study designs, and quantitative and qualitative analytic techniques.

Section II—General Principles and Performance Guidelines

The following principles are recommended by the Task Force.

1. Annual performance appraisals for faculty will be established. These appraisals will serve to provide constructive feedback for performance maintenance and professional growth and may be utilized in decisions regarding awarding of tenure, promotion, graduate faculty status, salary adjustments, and internal hiring. These appraisals are not intended to be used as a basis for dismissing tenured faculty members.

2. At the department level, guidelines will establish levels of acceptable performance (that is, criterion-referenced standards) which will be made available to professors no later than the beginning of the evaluation period (see Appendices II and III for examples of guidelines used elsewhere). In addition, guidelines related to ipsative (self-referenced) and normative (group-referenced) evaluation procedures may be established by individual departments (see Principle 4).

3. The format and process for documenting performance will be explicit. Documentation will consist of both detailed and explanatory or integrative information. For example, a detailed listing may be presented in a form such as the current Faculty Report of Professional Activities. Explanatory or integrative information may be contained in paragraph descriptions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, or within a scholarship portfolio (see definitions and rationale, pp. 8-9). This explanatory documentation of important aspects of one's scholarship can contribute to the self reflection inherent in the improvement of professional practice.

4. Each faculty member will develop a Professional Scholarship Plan (PSP) which will include scholarship goals for the year and the means for achieving such goals. Consensus on these goals will be developed through collaboration with the department. Individual faculty PSPs will be used as a basis to develop departmental goals consistent with the missions of the department, the School of Education, and the University. Each PSP will include specific minimal criteria to evaluate the satisfactory accomplishment of goals and objectives. These criteria may also be used for such decisions as awarding of tenure, promotion, and salary adjustments.

Tenured faculty may choose to describe and define their scholarly activities during a two-year period in a way which varies from the traditional emphasis on all aspects of scholarship to focus on one specific element. For example, the two-year period could be used to enhance the teaching aspect of scholarship, to develop a major pro-

posals for outside funding, to embark on a significant research program, or to engage in a significant service activity.

Faculty members may be provided support in areas of research, teaching, and service by faculty mentors, department chairs, and administrators in order to ensure adequate progress toward goals. Budgetary resources should be provided to cover startup costs for teaching and research and to support service at the professional level. Assignments and scheduling should take into account the time demands of supervision, advising, and course preparation and should aim to provide faculty with at least one full day each week to devote to research activities. Faculty should be provided support through mentoring, recognition, and protection of their time, and should be provided opportunities to observe colleagues teaching, to participate in teaching workshops, and to communicate and collaborate with colleagues regarding teaching.

For tenure-track faculty, service activities should be primarily discipline- or profession-related. Service at the department level should initially be focused on activities required of all department members, or on activities related to the profession, teaching, or research. Service at the School and/or University level also should be kept to a minimum initially and should involve primarily activities directly related to the profession, teaching, or research.

5. In sum, the use of these principles and guidelines will enhance the enculturation of new faculty into the School of Education through the active involvement of experienced faculty. We anticipate that when all faculty are apprised of expectations and actively engaged in the peer review process that increased collegiality and improved productivity will result.

Section III—Peer Collaboration, Induction/Mentoring, and Scholarship Portfolios

The previous section presented numerous recommendations surrounding forms of documentation, establishment of criterion-referenced and ipsative (self-defined) guidelines, and use of a peer collaboration process. As professionals we have long expected and profited from peer critique, feedback, and review of our research efforts (e.g., articles, presentations). It follows that we could benefit from feedback regarding teaching and service activities. Herein we define, defend, and set forth recommended procedures of peer collaboration to facilitate and help ensure enhanced productivity for all SOE faculty. First, terminology will be clarified.

Definitions and Rationale

Induction/Mentoring

This process is designed to socialize new faculty into the department, School, and University specifically to provide assistance to develop both interpersonal and professional agendas. Mentors would apply for and receive "service" recognition via scholarship portfolio documentation. Different versions of the induction/mentoring process would be required depending on the nature and type of university experience the new faculty member brings to ISU. At a minimum, all new faculty should be apprised of processes and procedures described in this Task Force report.

Scholarship Portfolios

An increasingly accepted method for documenting and improving teaching is combining peer collaboration with use of a portfolio. A portfolio is a creative act which is predicated on the following interrelated propositions, according to Edgerton, et al. (1993, p.4):

First, portfolios can capture the intellectual substance and "situated-ness" of teaching, service, and research in ways that other methods of evaluation cannot. Second, because of this capacity, portfolios encourage faculty to take important, new roles in the documentation, observation, and review of service, teaching, and research. Third, because they prompt faculty to take these new roles, portfolios are a particularly powerful tool for improvement. Fourth, as more faculty come to use them, portfolios can help forge a new campus culture of professionalism about research, teaching, and service.

Such a scholarship portfolio will permit individuals to represent selectively the important aspects of their scholarship (of teaching, discovery, integration, or application) in different settings. Such scholarship can be carried out in various settings of the contemporary university—within traditional "service" arenas (e.g., standing and ad hoc committees); within traditional "teaching" arenas (e.g., consultations, classrooms, clinical supervision); and within traditional "research" arenas (e.g., conferences, peer-reviewed journals).

A critical component of using scholarship portfolios is to promote dialogue about scholarship. Such dialogue may result from the process of constructing the portfolio as well as sharing it with colleagues through peer collaboration. Dialogue about scholarship efforts through both portfolio construction and peer collaboration is useful for the following reasons (adapted from the AAHE Project Workbook, January 1995):

1. Learning to teach involves learning from experience; and learning from experience may be enhanced by insights provided by colleagues. Furthermore, various service activities and research agendas may be better understood and connected if colleagues regularly engage in discourse about them.

2. Faculty value the regard of their scholarly peers. Thus, teaching may have greater status as a worthy scholarly endeavor when it is reviewed by peers. In a similar fashion, inclusion of various service contributions would enable peers to more fully appreciate contributions to the department, School, and University.

3. Public concern for the cost and quality of higher education is leading to intrusive policies designed to make higher education more accountable. The best antidote to bureaucratic accountability is for higher education to strengthen its own mechanisms of professional accountability, for example, through peer collaboration and scholarship portfolios.

Recommended Procedures

Induction/Mentoring

Although faculty are hired by the University, they are situated in a particular department. As such, it is logical that the department embrace responsibility to mentor its new members. We recommend that the department coordinate and oversee induction efforts that would inform, socialize, and orient new faculty to various department, School, and University operations.

Departments will select individuals to serve on a two-year mentoring team for new faculty. A team may include faculty from other departments where appropriate. The selection process should involve application via scholarship portfolio and should result in important service recognition for the mentoring individuals. In addition, the induction/mentoring team should document their approaches and strategies, reflect upon their own impact, and subsequently provide suggestions for improvement for the future use of these strategies. Prior to assuming a role on an induction/mentoring team, faculty should receive training and materials related to their responsibility. Periodically, induction/mentoring teams should meet with the Dean or Associate Dean to share ideas and evaluate the process.

Peer Collaboration

Peer collaboration can be carried out in many ways in addition to induction/mentoring and dialogue based on scholarship portfolios. The first two strategies listed below, which contain advantages and limitations, were explored by departments in the AAHE project (Hutchings, 1995).

1) Faculty Pairings for Mutual Assistance

This approach is an alternative to mentoring in that there are no implied status differences. Faculty pair up as true peers for mutual assistance and exchange of ideas. The focus could be upon their scholarship portfolios or faculty could undertake and share responses to various exercises in the AAHE project workbook (Hutchings, 1995).

2) Scholarship Circles and Other Group Collaborations

This cluster of approaches encompasses a variety of arrangements in which faculty focus on particular issues and practices over time. Typically four to ten faculty members work together for at least a semester to address questions and concerns about teaching, research, and/or service. At least three variations are possible: a) *Scholarship Circles to Serve Individualized Objectives* in which the goal of group collaboration may be to assist individual participants with their own personal objectives and agendas; b) *Scholarship Circles Connected to Multi-Sectioned Courses or Research Agendas* in which a group of colleagues who share a common concern or project work together to clarify and improve their approaches; or c) *Scholarship Circles Built into Program Review* in which faculty with responsibility for particular programs raise curricular, pedagogical, advising, and/or other questions.

The following principles for scholarship circles may enhance productivity:

- Be clear about the purpose of the group and what individuals hope to gain from the experience. This can be accomplished by laying out goals, ground rules, and expectations at the opening meeting.
- Focus on concrete examples and particulars such as sharing samples of student work, course syllabi, or specific service activities. General discussions about teaching, research, or service in general are less likely to contribute to critical insights.
- Find ways to document, preserve, and share the work of the scholarship circle. Future groups and other colleagues can benefit from shared insights.

3) Pilot Peer Collaboration Teams

This experimental approach would include three to five faculty members representing several departments who commit to a one- to three-year period to serve as collegial reviewers/coaches for each other. Teams work with the Dean or Associate Dean, submit names and rationale for composition of the team (e.g. currently working on a teaching, service, or research project together), and develop scholarship portfolios while piloting one of the Scholarship Circle menu options listed above. Both departments and the School of Education would benefit from supporting faculty engaged in the pilot peer collaboration team in that they would be expected to provide future leadership regarding use of scholarship portfolios and peer collaboration processes. This support could range from re-allocated time to remuneration to significant service recognition.

Scholarship Portfolios

Portfolios in general, and teaching portfolios in particular, have become more widely used and accepted over the past several years. During that time the AAHE has studied campus use of teaching portfolios. The following suggestions about teaching portfolios (adapted from Hutchings, 1995, pp. 6-7) can be expanded to include scholarship portfolios and are worthy of consideration:

- Seek early agreement about the purpose of portfolios, how the information will be used, who owns it, and what is at stake.
- Be selective. Make the distinction between notebooks which amass every possible scrap of evidence and a portfolio which is a sampling of performance and accompanying evidence.
- Rather than a miscellaneous collection, think of the portfolio as a case, a thesis, an argument which contains carefully selected, relevant evidence and examples.
- Organize the portfolio around goals which can represent the individual (ipsative criteria) or department, School, and/or University goals (criterion-referenced).
- Use the portfolio to clarify goals, expectations, and roles. This could easily become part of constructing and documenting Professional Scholarship Plans (PSPs).
- Include various kinds of evidence (e.g. quantitative and qualitative) from various sources (e.g. former and cur-

rent students, current and former colleagues, professional colleagues from other campuses).

- Where appropriate, provide reflective analysis and commentary on the evidence provided. Reflective analysis serves at least several purposes: 1) to provide opportunity for the faculty member to clarify his/her own thinking, 2) to reveal to the reviewer the thinking behind various kinds of evidence, and 3) to help readers know what to look for—to understand the significance of the evidence.
- Experiment with various structures and formats and develop an assessment plan to determine whether portfolios are achieving intended purposes and how they might be refined.

Use of Scholarship Portfolios represents a departure from traditional performance appraisals, tenure, promotion, and/or other procedures used to assess, inform, and acknowledge faculty contributions. As such, a Portfolio Development Center, perhaps in conjunction with the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), in which faculty would receive technical assistance would be helpful. Such a center might hire an external consultant who would work with the CTL and SOE faculty to identify needs, establish procedures, and launch the initiative.

References

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: New priorities for the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., and Quinlan, K. (1993). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching*. Washington, DC: AAHE.
- Hutchings, P. (Ed.). (1995, January). *From idea to prototype: The peer review of teaching*. Washington, DC: AAHE.
- Illinois State University. (1996). *College of Education 1996 CFSC Document*. Normal, IL: Author.
- Indiana State University. (1994, April). *Strategic Planning Report of the School of Education*. Terre Haute, IN: Author.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What reasons did you perceive for the undertaking of this initiative?
2. What role have you played in the Role of the Professoriate process?
3. What are the most interesting aspects of the document itself, in your view?
4. Has the process used for the ROP initiative been relevant? In what ways? What concerns have you had in the past? What concerns, if any, do you have now about this initiative?
5. How has the *process* affected you and your department?
6. How have you and your department used the *ROP document*? What were and are your concerns?
7. What should a document like this do for us as professors?
8. What are the differences between this document and what we have had previously that defined the job description? (refer to Faculty Handbook or Departmental Guidelines, if asked)
9. How do you see this initiative influencing faculty roles 5 to 10 years from now? (Alternatively, how could the ROP initiative be a useful tool for helping faculty move into new roles?)

10. What else would you like to comment on before we end the interview?

APPENDIX C

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

On October 5, 1995 the Task Force on the Role of the Professoriate (ROP) was commissioned by Dean Huffman-Joley. The task force was comprised of the following 12 members, two from each of the six School of Education departments:

Lisa Bischoff, Educational and School Psychology, School of Education Congress
Karen Dutt, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Frances Lowden, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Susan Martin Macke, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations, School of Education Congress
Maurice Miller, Communication Disorders and Special Education
William Osmon, Counseling, School of Education Congress
Raymond Quist, Communication Disorders and Special Education
Cathleen Rafferty, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Linda Sperry, Educational and School Psychology
Todd Whitaker, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations
Robert Williams, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION STANDARDS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Clear Goals

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly?
Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Adequate Preparation

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

Appropriate Methods

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Significant Results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective Presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

Note: From *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate* (p. 36). By C. E. Glassick, M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff, 1997, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. Copyright 1997. Reprinted with permission.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Cathleen D. Rafferty is professor in the department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN. She spent 10 years as a middle school teacher in Illinois and Colorado prior to completing her doctorate in 1987 at the University of Colorado-Boulder. Her primary interests include performance-based teacher education, the impact of information technology on literacy and learning, professional development schools, and the role of the professoriate.

Linda L. Sperry is associate professor in the department of Educational and School Psychology at Indiana State University. She completed her doctorate in developmental psychology in 1991 at the University of Chicago. Her primary interests include the impact of socio-cultural influences on the developing mind, democratic teaching practices, and the role of the professoriate.

Gail Huffman-Joley is dean emerita of the School of Education and professor in the department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education. She has served as founding chairperson of the Indiana Professional Standards Board and currently serves on the Board of Directors of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Her primary interests include educational reform, teachers' career continuum, professional development schools, and the teaching and learning of reading and the language arts.

"This is an informative and well-written description of the process used by an established School of Education to address an issue we all face—redefining the faculty role and reward structures in education units."

M. Stephen Lilly, California State University, San Marcos

In 1995, the School of Education at Indiana State University launched an initiative to redefine the roles and responsibilities of its professoriate. This case study details that effort. Using Michael Fullan's change theories to guide their own actions, the authors demonstrate that an open, democratic process is essential in an undertaking of this scope. This study details critical components of any change initiative and is of value to those considering a reexamination of the role of the professoriate on their own campus.



This monograph is published under the auspices of the
AACTE Academy for Leadership Development,
a program devoted to the advancement of leadership
in today's schools, colleges, and departments of education.



1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300

Washington, DC 20005-4701

Tel: 202/293-2450 ▲ Fax: 202/457-8095

Web: www.aacte.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE